



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,927	11/24/2003	Marvin P. Loeb	Loeb.M-03	6910
7:	590 03/11/2005		EXAMINER	
Patent Law & Venture Group			JOHNSON III, HENRY M	
Suite 150 3140 Red Hill A	Avenue		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
* *	A 92626-3440		3739	

DATE MAILED: 03/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summers	10/721,927	LOEB, MARVIN P.	ED
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Henry M Johnson, III	3739	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to sy within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) dawill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the application to become ABANDON	imely filed  ays will be considered timely.  In the mailing date of this communication  ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	on.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 N</u>	<u>larch 2004</u> .		
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa closed in accordance with the practice under B	•		s
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra  5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.  7) ☐ Claim(s) 13-16 is/are objected to.  8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 24 November 2003 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11)□ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ object drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So tion is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(	(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. Is have been received in Applica rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)			
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail [ 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:		

### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 2, the "blanket" incorporation by reference is improper. See 37 CFR 1.57.

On page 8, both the end portion (line 27) and the adhesive (line 28) use the label 23.

Appropriate correction is required.

# Claim Objections

Claims 13 and 16 are objected to because of the following informalities: The steps of the claim are not consistent with the preamble. The steps are not interpretable as limiting the reuse of an optical fiber, without excessive reliance on the specification. Appropriate correction is required.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 3 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 3 and 9, no separate sleeve is specifically cited and it is implied in claim 1 that the sleeve is part of the optical fiber. Therefore, the fingers as claimed would not grip the fiber.

Art Unit: 3739

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Page 3

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,151,962 to Walker et al. Walker et al. teach fiber optic cable assemblies for use in surgical and medical applications. A handle (Fig. 7A, # 76) is disclosed with a central bore and a stem (Fig. 7A, # 80) that is interpreted as a cannula. The channel is axially aligned with the stem (Col. 8, line 30) and is a larger diameter than the stem (Fig. 7A). The transition from channel to stem is interpreted as a shoulder. Walker et al. further discloses a fiber optic may be secured to the handle by a hex bolt with a compression fitting. The interactions of the structure with an optical fiber are intended use.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 8, 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Walker et al. in view of U.S. Patent 5,417,684 to Jackson et al. Walker et al. is discussed above, but does not teach a compression nut with axial fingers or tapered threads. Jackson et al. disclose a surgical device that includes a fitting with fingers (Fig. 31, # 434) and

Page 4

Art Unit: 3739

tapered threads (Fig. 32, # 422). Compression fittings are well known in a plethora of arts and it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the compression fitting of Jackson et al. in the invention of Walker et al. as one of many alternative compression fitting configurations. Likewise, the use of a compressible tube in such fittings is well known.

Claims 4, 5, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Walker et al. Walker discloses a bend distal end (Fig. 7A), but does not disclose using Nitinol <sup>®</sup> or other super-elastic material. Super-elastic materials are well known in the art and it would have obvious to one skilled in the art to use a super-elastic material if the device was used with a complimentary device that would alter its configuration and it was desired to have the device return to a predetermined shape.

## Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 14 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. U.S. Patents 5300,061 to Easley et al. and 4,756,597 to Hahn et al. both teach a stepped passage for an optical fiber capable of limiting movement due to a sleeve or cladding having a larger diameter than the fiber core. U.S. Patent 5,913,853 to Loeb et al. discloses a compression fitting to secure an optic fiber.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Henry M Johnson, III whose telephone number is (571) 272-4768. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 6:00 AM to 3:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda C Dvorak can be reached on (571) 272-4764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Henry M. Johnson, III

Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3739